

**REMARKS**

At the time of the Second Office Action dated April 15, 2008, claims 1-11 were pending and rejected in this application.

**CLAIMS 1-11 ARE REJECTED UNDER THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF 35 U.S.C. § 112**

On pages 2 and 3 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner asserted that claims 1-11 are indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that the claims have been amended to remove the "should be" phrase identified by the Examiner. Applicants have also amended independent claims 1 and 10-11 to provide antecedent basis for the term "said registration destination selection unit." Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 1-11 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**CLAIMS 1, 7, AND 9-11 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS  
BASED UPON MATSUNAGA ET AL., U.S. PATENT PUBLICATION NO. 2003/0088568  
(HEREINAFTER MATSUNAGA), IN VIEW OF MOORE, U.S. PATENT PUBLICATION NO.  
2004/0098247 (HEREINAFTER MOORE)**

On pages 3-6 of the Second Office Action, the Examiner asserted that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been realistically impelled to modify Matsunaga in view of

1 Moore to arrive at the invention corresponding to that claimed. This rejection is respectfully  
2 traversed.

3  
4 Independent claims 1 and 10-11 have each been amended to include the limitations  
5 previously presented in claim 2 (now cancelled), which the Examiner indicated as being  
6 allowable subject matter in the First Office Action. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit  
7 withdrawal of the imposed rejection of claims 1, 7, and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness  
8 based upon Matsunaga in view of Moore.

9  
10 **CLAIM 8 IS REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED UPON**  
11 **MATSUNAGA IN VIEW OF MOORE AND TAKEDA, U.S. PATENT NO. 5,477,450**

12 Claim 8 depends from claim 1 and is allowable over the applied prior art for the same  
13 reasons as claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully solicit withdrawal of the imposed rejection  
14 of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Matsunaga in view of Moore and  
15 Takeda.

Applicants have made every effort to present claims which distinguish over the prior art, and it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance. However, Applicants invite the Examiner to call the undersigned if it is believed that a telephonic interview would expedite the prosecution of the application to an allowance. Accordingly, and in view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims.

Although Applicants believe that all claims are in condition for allowance, the Examiner is directed to the following statement found in M.P.E.P. § 706(II):

When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible should offer a definite suggestion for correction. (emphasis added)

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: May 27, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott D. Paul/

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

Phone: (561) 922-3845

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320